arXiv:1402.6146v2 [math.CO] 25 Mar 2014

AN IDENTITY OF DISTRIBUTIVE LATTICES

HIMADRI MUKHERJEE

Abstract. In a finite distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ we define two functions $s(\alpha) = \#\{\delta \in \mathcal{L} | \delta \leq \alpha\}$ and $l(\alpha) = \#\{\delta \in \mathcal{L} | \delta \geq \alpha\}$. In this present article we prove that the sum of these two functions over a finite distributive lattice are equal.

1. Introduction

In this present article we look at the functions $s(\alpha) = \#\{\delta \in \mathcal{L} | \delta \leq \alpha\}$ which we will call "smaller" function and $l(\alpha) = \#\{\delta \in \mathcal{L} | \delta \geq \alpha\}$ which we will call "larger" function, these functions are closely related to the rank $r(\alpha)$ and co-rank $cr(\alpha)$ functions of the lattice and clearly not same unless the lattice in question is a chain lattice. Even though it's clear that $\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}} r(\delta) = \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}} cr(\delta)$ it is not trivial to demonstrate that "lower sum" $\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}} s(\delta)$ is equal to the "upper sum" $\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}} l(\delta)$. In this present article we provide an interesting proof of the fact. We give an example as below: Hasse diagram of a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ is given below, the nodes in the first graph denotes the numbers $s(\delta)$ and the numbers in the nodes of the second graph denotes $l(\delta)$. Even though the numbers are different in places the sum comes to 41 in both the cases.





Let us state below our main theorem that the lower sum and upper sum of a finite distributive lattice are equal.

Date: March 26, 2014.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 06D50.

Theorem 1.1. *For a finite distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ we have,* $\sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} s(\delta) = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} l(\delta)$

We take a maximal join irreducible element $\beta \in J$ and look at the pruned lattice, see 2.4 for a definition, $\mathcal{L}_\beta$. We then apply induction on the number of join irreducibles of the lattice $\mathcal{L}$. For a trivial lattice with $\#J(\mathcal{L}) = 1$ the claim is obvious. Before the proof we need to recall few definitions and prove a few lemmas.

2. Definitions and Lemmas

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\theta > \delta$ be a cover in a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$, then there is a unique join irreducible ϵ such that $\theta = \delta \vee \epsilon$.*

Proof. Using Birkhoff's representation theorem [1] we write the elements $\theta, \delta \in \mathcal{L}$ as ideals in the poset of join irreducibles I_θ, I_δ. Since θ covers δ we have $I_\theta \setminus I_\delta = \{\epsilon\}$ for a join irreducible element ϵ. It is clear that this epsilon serves the purpose. □

Lemma 2.2. *If $\theta \vee \delta \geq \beta$ where β is a join irreducible then either θ or δ is larger than β*

Proof. Since $\theta \vee \beta \geq \delta$ we have $I_\beta \subset I_\theta \cup I_\delta$. But we have $\beta \in I_\beta$, β being a join irreducible. So we have $\beta \in I_\theta$ or $\beta \in I_\delta$. □

For a lattice $\mathcal{L}$ and an elements $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ let us define a sublattice $\Gamma_\delta = \{\beta \in \mathcal{L} : \beta \sim \delta\}$. Let us also define a set of functions f, s, l on the lattice $\mathcal{L}$ taking values in $\mathbb{N}$ as follows: $s(\delta) = \#\{\beta : \beta \leq \delta\}$ and $l(\delta) = \#\{\beta : \beta \geq \delta\}$ and $f(\delta) = \#\Gamma_\delta = s(\delta) + l(\delta) - 1$.
Let us recall from [2] the following theorem, where the number of non-comparable pairs of elements in a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ was denoted by $n(\mathcal{L})$.

Theorem 2.3. *For a distributive lattice $\mathcal{L}$ we have*

$$n(\mathcal{L}) = 1/2(\#\mathcal{L}^2 - \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} f(\delta))$$

In light of the above theorem we would like to calculate the sum $\sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} f(\delta)$. Using the functions s and l we can rewrite the sum as $\sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} s(\delta) + \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} l(\delta) - \#\mathcal{L}$. So to understand the sum $F = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} f(\delta)$ we have to understand the sums $S = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} s(\delta)$ and $L = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}} l(\delta)$. The following theorem is one step towards understanding the two sums S and L.
Let us start with a recollection of a concept called pruning, which will be essential for the induction step, from the paper [4]. Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ be a maximal join-irreducible element. Let us define a sublattice $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ of $\mathcal{L}$

which we called the pruned lattice of $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to the maximal join irreducible α.

Definition 2.4. The subset $\mathcal{L}_\alpha = \{\beta \in \mathcal{L} : \beta \not\geq \alpha\}$ is called the pruned sublattice of the lattice $\mathcal{L}$ with respect to the maximal join irreducible α . So the subset $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ consist of all the elements β which are either smaller than or non-comparable to α.

Let us also recall the following definition of embedded sublattices from [3].

Definition 2.5. A sublattice $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{L}$ is called an embedded sublattice if for every $\theta, \delta \in \mathcal{D}$ whenever there are elements $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \vee \beta = \theta$ and $\alpha \wedge \beta = \delta$ then $\alpha, \beta \in \mathcal{D}$.

In the lemma below we will establish that "pruned sublattice" is truly a sublattice and is also embedded.

Lemma 2.6. *The pruned lattice $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ is a sublattice of $\mathcal{L}$ that is embedded.*

Proof. Pruned subset is a sublattice since if $x, y \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$ then $x \wedge y \not\geq \alpha$ and if $x \vee y \geq \alpha$ then by 2.2 we have either $x \geq \alpha$ or $y \geq \alpha$ which leads to contradiction. For the embedded part if for θ, δ we have $\theta \vee \delta$ and $\theta \wedge \delta$ in $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ then neither x nor y can be larger than α again by 2.2 □

With the above notation in mind let us define a new set of functions, let α be a maximal join irreducible and let $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ be the corresponding pruned sublattice. Then let us define $l_\alpha(\delta) = \#\{x \in \mathcal{L} | x \geq \delta\} \cap \mathcal{L}_\alpha$, $s_\alpha(\delta) = \#\{x \in \mathcal{L} | x \leq \delta\} \cap \mathcal{L}_\alpha$, $f_\alpha(\delta) = \#\Gamma_\delta \cap \mathcal{L}_\alpha$.

Lemma 2.7. $l(\delta) = l_\alpha(\delta) + l(\alpha \cap \delta)$

Proof. From the definitions we have $l(\delta) - l_\alpha(\delta) = \#\{\beta : \beta \geq \alpha \text{ and } \beta \geq \delta\}$. But $\beta \geq \alpha$ and $\beta \geq \delta$ if and only if we have $\beta \geq \alpha \vee \delta$. So putting all these together we get $l(\delta) - l_\alpha(\delta) + \#\{\beta : \beta \geq \alpha \vee \delta\}$. From the definition of the function l we write $\#\{\beta : \beta \geq \alpha \vee \delta\}$ as $l(\alpha \vee \delta)$ and get the statement of the lemma. □

Lemma 2.8. $s(\delta) = s_\alpha(\delta) + \#\{\beta : \beta \geq \alpha \text{ and } \beta \leq \delta\}$. *To simplify the notations let us denote $\#\{\beta : \beta \geq \alpha \text{ and } \beta \leq \delta\}$ by $h_\alpha(\delta)$*

Proof. Proof of this fact is straightforward from the definition. □

We want to show that the sum $I = \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}} l(\delta) - s(\delta) = 0$. To show that we want to use an induction argument on the size of the lattice $\mathcal{L}$. Let α be a maximal join irreducible in the lattice $\mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ be its pruned lattice, let us denote the complement of the pruned lattice by

$X_\alpha = \mathcal{L} \setminus \mathcal{L}_\alpha$. Note that from the definition of the pruned lattice the structure of the set X_α can be written rather easily so we include that as a lemma.

Lemma 2.9. *$X_\alpha = \{\beta \in \mathcal{L} : \beta \geq \alpha\}$, is an embedded sub-lattice.*

Proof. Clear from the definition 2.4. □

With the above definitions in mind we will split the sum $I = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}}(l(\delta)-s(\delta))$ into two sums such as $I = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha}(l(\delta)-\sigma(\delta))+\sum_{\delta\in X_\alpha}(l(\delta)-s(\delta))$. For notational simplicity let us denote the first part of the sum namely $\sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha}(l(\delta)-\sigma(\delta))$ as S_α and the second part namely $\sum_{\delta\in X_\alpha}(l(\delta)-s(\delta))$ as T_α. Thus we have $I = S_\alpha + T_\alpha$, and observe that if we prove $I = 0$ then the main theorem 1.1 follows.

Lemma 2.10.

$$S_\alpha = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha} l(\alpha \vee \delta)$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} S_\alpha &= \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha}(l(\delta) - s(\delta)) \\ &= \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha} l_\alpha(\delta) + l(\alpha\vee\delta) - s_\alpha(\delta) - h_\alpha(\delta) \end{aligned}$$

(1)

But since $\delta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$ we do not have any $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ which is larger than α and smaller than δ, since that will imply $\delta \geq \alpha$ contrary to our assumption. So the number $h_\alpha(\delta) = \#\{\beta : \beta \geq \alpha \text{ and } \beta \leq \delta\}$ is zero. Thus :

$$S_\alpha = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha} l_\alpha(\delta) + l(\alpha\vee\delta) - s_\alpha(\delta)$$

But by induction the sum $\sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha}(l_\alpha(\delta) - s_\alpha(\delta))$ is zero. So we have $S_\alpha = \sum_{\delta\in\mathcal{L}_\alpha} l(\alpha\vee\delta)$ as required. □

Let us now similarly investigate the number T_α.

Lemma 2.11. $T_\alpha = -\sum_{\delta\in X_\alpha} s_\alpha(\delta)$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} T_\alpha &= \sum_{\delta\in X_\alpha}(l(\delta) - s(\delta)) \\ &= \sum_{\delta\in X_\alpha}(l_\alpha(\delta) + l(\alpha\wedge\delta) - s_\alpha(\delta) - h_\alpha(\delta) \end{aligned}$$

(2)

Since $\delta \geq \alpha$ the number $l_\alpha(\delta) = 0$ and $\alpha \wedge \delta = \delta$. So we rewrite the above equation to:

$$= \sum_{\delta \in X_\alpha} (l(d) - h_\alpha(\delta)) - \sum_{\delta \in X_\alpha} s_\alpha(\delta)$$

(3)

Looking at the sublattice X_α observe that the function $h_\alpha(\delta)$ is just the "smaller function" for the lattice X_α. Hence using the induction hypothesis we get

$$\sum_{\delta \in X_\alpha} (l(d) - h_\alpha(\delta)) = 0$$

Thus :

$$T_\alpha = -\sum_{\delta \in X_\alpha} s_\alpha(\delta)$$

□

Let us summarise the above two lemmas in the following lemma:

Lemma 2.12.

$$I = S_\alpha + T_\alpha = \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha} l(\alpha \vee \delta) - \sum_{\delta \in X_\alpha} s_\alpha(\delta)$$

Definition 2.13. For $\gamma \in X_\alpha$ let us denote $C_\gamma = \{x \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha | x \vee \alpha = \gamma\}$

Lemma 2.14. *For any $\gamma \in X_\alpha$, C_γ is non-empty and is a sublattice of $\mathcal{L}$.*

Proof. Let a be the maximal element in $\mathcal{L}$ which is smaller than γ but not larger than α. If there exist no such element then every element a smaller than γ is also larger than α, which will mean α is the smallest element in $\mathcal{L}$. But that is not the case since α is a maximal join irreducible. Consider $a \vee \alpha$, since both a and α are smaller than γ, $a \vee \alpha \leq \gamma$. If $\gamma = a \vee \alpha$ then we are done, and if γ covers $a \vee \alpha$ then by 2.1 we have a join irreducible ϵ such that $\gamma = \epsilon \vee a \vee \alpha$ or $\gamma = (\epsilon \vee a) \vee \alpha$ which shows $\epsilon \vee a \in C_\gamma$. And if there is γ_1 such that $\gamma > \gamma_1 > a \vee \alpha$, by induction on the rank of γ we have an element b such that $\gamma_1 = b \vee \alpha$. But note that $\gamma > b$ and $b \ngeq \alpha$ and we have $\gamma > a \vee b$ and $a \vee b \ngeq \alpha$ which contradicts the maximality of a.
For the lattice part, if $x, y \in C_\gamma$ then $x \vee y \vee \alpha = x \vee \gamma$ but since $x \in C_\gamma$ we have $x \leq \gamma$ so $x \vee \gamma = \gamma$. Similarly for $(x \wedge y) \vee \alpha = (x \vee \alpha) \wedge (y \vee \alpha) = \gamma \wedge \gamma = \gamma$. □

Definition 2.15. Let x_γ be the maximal element of C_γ.

Lemma 2.16. *For each $\delta \in X_\alpha$ we have $s_\alpha(\delta) = s_\alpha(x_\delta) = s(x_\delta)$*

Proof. Since $\delta \in X_\alpha$ we have $\delta = x_\delta \vee \alpha$ from the definition of x_δ. And we know $s_\alpha(\delta) = \#\{\beta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha : \beta \leq \delta\}$. But note by the following argument that the set $\{\beta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha : \beta \leq \delta\}$ is equal to the set $\{\beta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha : \beta \leq x_\delta\}$.
Clearly if $\beta \leq x_\delta$ then $\beta \leq \delta = x_\delta \vee \alpha$ for the inclusion other way around see that if $y \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha$ and $y \leq \delta$ then if y is non-comparable to x_δ then we have $x_\delta \leq y \vee x_\delta \leq \delta$ which contradicts the maximality of x_δ unless $y \vee x_\delta = \delta$. But $\delta \in X_\alpha$ which means $\delta \geq \alpha$ or $y \vee x_\delta \geq \alpha$ so by 2.2 we have either y or x_δ larger than α which is a contradiction to the assumption that both y and x_δ are in $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$. So it means y is comparable to x_δ but it cannot be larger since it would violate the maximality of x_δ so we have $y \leq x_\delta$, or the two sets are equal.
Which means $s_\alpha(\delta) = \#\{\beta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha : \beta \leq \delta\} = \#\{\beta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha : \beta \leq x_\delta\} = s_\alpha(x_\delta)$. Now since x_δ is by definition in $\mathcal{L}_\alpha$ we have $s_\alpha(x_\delta) = s(x_\delta)$. □

Lemma 2.17.

$$\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha} l(\alpha \vee \delta) = \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \#C_\gamma l(\gamma)$$

Proof. If $\delta \in C_\gamma$ then by definition we have $\gamma = \alpha \vee \delta$ or $l(\alpha \vee \delta) = l(\gamma)$. So $\sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha} l(\alpha \vee \delta) = \sum_{\gamma = \alpha \vee \delta \in X_\alpha} l(\gamma)$ we can do this change of variable since we have $\cup_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} C_\gamma = \mathcal{L}_\alpha$. But $\sum_{\gamma = \alpha \vee \delta \in X_\alpha} l(\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \#C_\gamma l(\gamma)$ □

Lemma 2.18.

$$\sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \#C_\gamma l(\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} s(x_\gamma)$$

Proof. Let A_γ be the set $\{\beta \in \mathcal{L} : \beta \leq x_\gamma\}$. So $s(x_\gamma) = \#A_\gamma$. On the set A_γ let us give a relation $\sim$ as follows: $a, b \in A_\gamma$ we will call $a \sim b$ if and only if $a \vee \alpha = b \vee \alpha$. Observe that this is an equivalence relation. Also observe that the equivalence classes are $C_{\gamma_i} = \{a | a \vee \alpha = \gamma_i\}$ where $\gamma_i \leq \gamma$. Thus we have $s(x_\gamma) = \#A_\gamma = \sum_{\gamma_i \in X_\alpha, \gamma_i \leq \gamma} C_{\gamma_i}$, if we sum the both sides up we get

$$\sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} s(x_\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \sum_{\gamma_i \leq \gamma, \gamma_i \in X_a} C_{g_i}$$

$$= \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \#C_\gamma \sum_{y \geq \gamma} 1$$

Since each C_{γ_i} is appearing $\sum_{y \geq \gamma_i} 1$ many times in the right hand sum. Now observe that $\sum_{y \geq \gamma} 1 = l(\gamma)$ so we can finally write:

$$\sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} s(x_\gamma) = \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \#C_\gamma l(\gamma)$$

. □

Theorem 2.19. $I = S_\alpha + T_\alpha = 0$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} S_\alpha + T_\alpha &= \sum_{\delta \in \mathcal{L}_\alpha} l(\alpha \vee \delta) - \sum_{\alpha \in X_\alpha} s_\alpha(\delta) \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \#C_\gamma l(\gamma) - \sum_{\delta \in X_\alpha} s_\alpha(x_\delta) \end{aligned}$$

by 2.16 and 2.17

$$= \sum_{\gamma \in X_\alpha} \#C_\gamma l(\gamma) - s(x_\gamma) = 0$$

by 2.17 and after changing the running variable to a common variable. And the last equality follows from 2.18. So we have proved the main theorem 1.1.

□

References

[1] G. Gratzer, *Lattice theory: first concepts and distributive lattices*, Dover pub. Inc., 2009.

[2] Himadri Mukherjee, *On the number of non-comparable pairs of elements in a distributive lattice* http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.7262

[3] V. Lakshmibai and H. Mukherjee, *Singular loci of Hibi toric varieties*,J Ramanujan Math. Soc. **26**(2011) no. 1 (1-29)

[4] Himadri Mukherjee, *On singularities of lattice varieties* http://arxiv.org/abs/1311.7267

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, IISER-Kolkata
E-mail address: himadri@iiserkol.ac.in